SUBJECT No. 148.

Annual sales of vending arrack.

Messrs. T. Venkatappa and Nadig Sankarappa, Shimoga Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The right of vending arrack is sold by auction annually. The purchaser has to pay between Rs. 40 and Rs. 60 per month for each shop. The quantity of arrack that is consumed in each shop is 30 or 40 gallons per month. If Government arrack only is sold, it fetches a profit of Re. 0-15-2 per gallon. Apparently, therefore, the contractor has to lose by the bargain. But what actually happens is that the contractor is still eager to have his shop at the same high rate. The cause of this is that mostly arrack illicitly distilled is sold in the shops and not that purchased from Government. This causes a heavy loss to Government. The quality of the arrack supplied to the consumers is also inferior and less healthy in its effect.

Some of the vendors dissolve soda in the arrack kept for sale. This causes much loss to the consumers.

A Special Inspector may be appointed for every two taluks with a staff of six peons for the detection of illicit distillation. All of them should be provided with arms, and police help must be made available to them. Liberal rewards should be given to informants and successful detectors.

The annual sales may be put an end to and the shops given to vendors who are known to be trustworthy and have not been punished for infringement of the prescribed rules. These may be paid the cost of the conveyance of arrack, the shop rent, and a fixed pay, and encouraged by being allowed favorable rates of commission on the quantities of arrack sold.

Reply of Government.—Special steps are being taken to put down illicit distillation. The proposals generally will be referred to the Excise Commissioner.

SUBJECT No. 149.

Liability of toddy contractors for the offences of their servants.

Mr. Venkatappa, Shimoga Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—On a representation mad last year, that toddy contractors should not be held re ponsible for offences committed by their servants, t Government were pleased to state that it was not possib to do so. The matter is again represented for recons deration as the Government would in no way be the los by holding the offender alone responsible in view of t fact that in several cases the contractor would even absent from the place of offence.

Reply of Government.—Noted. The root of the e seems to lie in one man taking up a large number of sho to the exclusion of the petty professional vendors.